DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 591 SP 034 918

AUTHOR	Mays, Judy L.; Pollard, Joyce S.
TITLE	Network. Regional Policy Analysts and Advisors.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, TX. Div. of Educational Services.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jul 93
CONTRACT	RP-91002003
NOTE	22p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; Educational Environment; Educational History; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Higher Education; *Minority Group Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; School Restructuring; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Role; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS	Professional Development Schools; Professionalization of Teaching; Reform Efforts; *Systemic Change

ABSTRACT

This publication contains two articles which focus on the teaching profession within the context of systemic reform. The first article, "Systemic Reform: Teachers and the Condition of Teaching," discusses the role and the preparation of teachers. The level of coordination among the various systems that relate to the teacher's role is greater for current systemic reform efforts than for earlier reform efforts. Professionalizing teaching may be a starting place for changing the role of the teacher, and both teacher preparation and teacher development are vital components of the overall process. With regard to policy development, ideas that support and promote systemic change include: coordinated policy development, new governance structures, new incentive structures, leadership development, and new teacher development systems. One promising teacher development strategy is the establishment of professional development schools. The second article, "Two-Way Streets: Improving Attraction and Access of Minorities to Teaching," focuses on the education pipeline that produces minority teachers. Demographic, economic, and social forces are producing an educational context which demands increasing representation of minority group teachers within the profession as part of a coordinated approach to providing equal access to education for all children. Both the informal context of education (e.g., family, community) and the formal context (e.g., schools, government, state boards of education, professional associations) influence whether minority group students are attracted and retained by the teacher preparation system. Ten proposals for improving minority access to teaching are listed. (IAH)

ED 367 591

NETWORK. REGIONAL POLICY ANALYSTS AND ADVISORS

SEDL

State Policy Planning Service
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-3281
(512) 476-6861

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Williams Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP034 918

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SEDL's
Regional Policy
Networkshop

July 1993

NETWORK

REGIONAL POLICY ANALYSTS AND ADVISORS

SP034 978

SEDL
State Policy Planning Service
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-3281
(512) 476-6861

Systemic Reform: Teachers and the Condition of Teaching

Network will be a regular publication for SEDL's Regional Policy Analysts' & Advisors' Network, which includes executive and legislative analysts and key state education decisionmakers. The purpose of this new publication from SEDL's State Policy Planning Service (SPPS) is to report on regional Networkshop meetings and to help Network members stay in touch between Networkshop meetings. Each issue will feature highlights of a Networkshop meeting, findings from relevant research studies or promising practices, comparative information among states, and contact persons in state or national organizations.

The two articles in this issue report on the comments of speakers and participants as they discussed the teaching profession in light of systemic reform.

Systemic reform has joined ***school improvement*** and ***restructuring*** in the education policymaker's lexicon. Members of SEDL's Regional Policy Analysts' & Advisors' Network began their dialogue about systemic reform and school finance during the first Networkshop meeting in 1991. In planning for the 1992 Networkshop, member analysts decided to continue their dialogue about systemic reform by examining two related areas: (1) the role and preparation of the teacher and (2) improving attraction and access of racial and ethnic minority teachers to teaching. They were joined in their discussions by members of institutions of higher education and representatives from state affiliates of national teachers' professional associations.

What does systemic reform mean for the teaching profession?

The recent debate focuses on systemic curriculum reform as an effort to develop a coherent set of learning goals to be achieved by all students. That means the goals are guided and supported by an integrated set of policies that send supporting signals about what students—and educators—are expected to know and be able to do. Instead of the current assortment of piecemeal policies, systemic reform tries to align curriculum, assessment (for students and teachers), professional preparation and development, as well as certification and licensure, around a set of learning outcomes for students.

This definition has clear implications for the organization of learning environments and the roles teachers will play in helping all students meet their learning goals. Teachers' roles are expected to change; they will be required to possess a new repertoire of knowledge and skills. In addition, given the growing economic, geographic, religious, racial, and ethnic diversity of our families, communities and classrooms, teachers (and those who

educate them) face considerable challenges in (1) creating education systems that reflect and respect diversity and (2) developing a teacher corps that is culturally diverse and culturally sensitive.

During the two-day discussions, speakers and Network members addressed the following questions: To support a change in the teacher's role, what is required of the other systems that relate to teaching: teacher preparation, professional development systems, and accountability (evaluation) systems? And what does systemic reform mean for prospective minority teachers? How can we be certain that "state conversations" about systemic reform include them?

Their discussions produced the following comments and considerations for state and local policymakers:

- Start with a vision of schooling and the broader education system.
- Coordinate the development of policies for assessment, recruitment, and licensing.
- Create new governance structures in institutions of higher education and public education to ensure coherent policy development and implementation.
- Design new incentive structures for the teaching profession.
- Create new systems of assessment and professional development for teachers and administrators.
- Improve effectiveness of schools in minority communities.
- Engage institutions of higher education, community organizations, and businesses in developing useful, ongoing teacher preservice and inservice programs.

Donna Wiseman, Associate Dean of Teacher Education in the College of Education at Texas A&M, discussed efforts to take teacher preparation and professional development into the local school building through A&M's Professional Development School. Arthur Wise, President of National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), discussed how teacher preparation, professional development, and teacher evaluation must support teachers' new roles in light of systemic reform.

The Evolution of Systemic Reform

Reforming the nation's public school systems has been a priority for policymakers during the last 10 years. Donna Wiseman pointed out that since the beginning of the 1980s, educational reform has occurred in two distinct "waves." The first wave was characterized by an increase in regulations governing the operation of schools. Longer school days, more testing for students, and increased requirements for high school graduation each represented an attempt to increase the level of student achievement. The second wave of reform during the late 1980s specified higher standards for teachers. Standardized tests were used to ensure the knowledge competency of teachers while new appraisal and accountability systems were designed to ensure quality in the workplace. Wiseman noted these reform efforts did little to affect the quality of interaction between students, teachers, and the curriculum.

According to Wiseman, the current wave of reform—systemic reform—focuses on strengthening the autonomy of school systems or individual schools and educational professionals. Policymakers have come to realize that people who are going to participate in change must be involved in helping

to develop the plan for how that change will take place. For that reason, she said, the newest wave is viewed, in part, as a "bottom up" strategy designed to empower teachers and give them ownership in the change process.

What Is Systemic Reform?

Systemic reform differs from earlier reform efforts because it focuses on "what" happens and how and when it happens, rather than "why" it happens. Wiseman reported that this current wave of reform doesn't place blame on any one faction or entity. A common vision guides the change process in which regular feedback is used to make continuous evaluations and adjustments. Systemic reform creates an environment in which a community of learners (students, teachers, parents, and administrators) work together in restructuring the process of teaching and learning, as well as in governing the school.

For Kermit McMurry, Vice Chancellor of the Oklahoma State Board of Regents and a Networkshop participant, systemic reform begins with a premise in which the sum of the parts will add up to one view of the whole. "For a view of the whole to emerge, independent public policymaking systems [need] to identify issues in concert, fashion a consensus on how best to resolve them, and advance policies in the form of strategic solutions," explained McMurry.

System Components and Culture

How do the "independent policymaking systems," (e.g., legislatures, state boards of education, postsecondary state boards, local school boards) come together to support a common vision for change? The idea of achieving and maintaining coherence within and among these systems is challenging for three reasons: (1) policy systems are complex and multi-layered; (2) as a result, contradictory trends in reform are playing out at national and state levels; and (3) systems have underlying cultures that one must consider in any systemic change effort.

Complex, multilayered systems. In understanding systemic reform, policymakers must pay attention both to some of the systems involved in the reform movement, and to the interrelationships *among* them. Some of the systems are (a) federal government, (b) state government, (c) local school districts and individual schools, and (d) surrounding communities. Influencing those entities is the higher education system that has, for the most part, remained on the sidelines of recent educational reform. That system includes the more than 1200 institutions of teacher education in the nation. The idea of systemic reform suggests a need for an ongoing process whereby policies and actions are integrated within and among all of these systems.

Researchers have pointed out that previous efforts in developing a coherent policy approach among state and federal systems have been thwarted by policy systems that are "fragmented, complex, and multilayered." Contradictory trends in policy development are playing out between standardization at the national level and variation at the local level. This paradox in policy development sends conflicting messages to local policy- and decisionmakers, and can make it difficult for them to keep a systemic vision in mind.

Contradictory policy trends. Art Wise described a national trend toward the

nationalization of educational policy. The focus of this trend is on increased accountability through the establishment of national goals. Interestingly enough, Wise pointed out, that while the nationalization of American education is taking place, policymakers are supporting state reform efforts that call for more local control of educational decisionmaking.

Envision a day when teachers will be held accountable for responsible professional practice; when they will be expected to know their subject matter and the professional and pedagogical bases of effective teaching, and to apply that knowledge in an ethical manner to the development of students in their charge.

—Art Wise

On a state level, different policy initiatives related to systemic reform have been put in place across the country. How these policies take shape is often a reflection of the political culture within the state and within local communities. Some states have a long-standing tradition of local control that precludes coordination across states in any meaningful manner. Other "mismatches" described among state and local entities are conflicting time schedules for the completion of certain reform efforts and lack of updated technology needed to carry out reform efforts.

All are serious problems, though probably not intractable, and possibly are outgrowths of institutional traditions or cultures. In devising systemic strategies to resolve or mitigate them, policymakers might consider the underlying cultures of independent policymaking entities.

Underlying culture. Systemic reform of teacher education must not only focus on the visible *components* of a system—policies, teacher development, curriculum, structures, and communities—but also on the underlying **culture** of a system. Culture refers to informal but powerful traits such as assumptions, attitudes, beliefs, norms and relationships between and among individuals and organizations within a system. So strong is the culture of public education that "remarkable similarities" exist among schools and school districts. The pervasive culture of public education has no doubt influenced the culture of teacher preparation even as it is today.

According to change researchers Michael Fullan and Matthew Miles, the concept of systemic reform is more powerful than restructuring, because it implies ideas and actions related to *restructuring* and *reculturing*. Restructuring and reculturing will need to take place both in public schools and within institutions for

Teacher preparation at a Professional Development School

I want to introduce you to some of the people who are at Jane Long Middle School on any afternoon. We have a group of four professors from Texas A&M, a graduate student, preservice teachers, regular classroom teachers and future teachers. Sometimes it is hard to tell the future teacher from the classroom teacher from the kids.

The preservice teachers work with their professors in the library, then they go into the classroom. They come back and work with their professors until 3:30 p.m. At that time, regular classroom teachers come into the library to learn with our university faculty and preservice teachers about middle school philosophy. They meet in small groups that include a university professor, a preservice teacher, and inservice teachers. It's a shame that this type of gathering has not happened very often. We in higher education have not talked with policymakers. And we haven't sat down and talked with those people who should be our direct partners—the people in the public schools.

It is not an easy task. Our teacher preparation program is changing, the school is changing because we are there, and the sixth-grade curriculum is changing. The professors are out in the school every afternoon, so their roles change. The classroom teachers have had to take on the load of working with future teachers and middle school philosophy. These teachers are tired. They've already taught a full day; now they are joining our seminar, and we are all working together.

This is the picture I want you to keep in mind—preservice and inservice teachers, university professors, and future teachers—because it is the mix we need for systemic reform, if we are really going to change.

—Donna Wiseman, Texas A&M University

teacher education. If teachers are to think differently about teaching, assume new roles, expand their teaching skills, and be prepared to deal with growing student diversity, there must be a stronger linkage between the ways in which they are prepared and the behaviors that will be expected of them once they are in schools.

Yet, changing organization cultures is difficult—painful and painstaking. Terence Deal (1992) has likened it to the grieving process because people are forced to give up beliefs or actions in which they have invested time and energy. And the benefit of change is slow or non-existent. In fact, networkshop participant McMurry suggested that more incentives exist for maintaining status quo than for supporting change. He described a lag in the change process as that point "when things seem to get worse before they can get better; when early cost to fix the challenge exceeds early rewards."

Moreover, changing the culture of schools, colleges, and departments of education means addressing their governing structures. In addition to the governance structure of the institution of higher education in which it is housed, a school, college or department of education is also subject to regulation by one or more of the following agencies: a) state boards of education, b) professional standards and practices boards, c) state legislatures, d) national accreditation and certification bodies, and e) state and national commissions. Thus, Henrik Gideonse has concluded it will take great effort to align the governance of teacher education with the present press for systemic reform.

Therein lies the crux of the problem of changing cultures of public education and teacher preparation. More attention must be paid to the system that defines and perpetuates teacher behavior. The nature and challenge of systemic reform for schools

force the notion of systemic reform at the level of teacher preparation. Art Wise reminded Networkshop participants that systemic reform of public schools simply will not happen without a simultaneous reform of teacher education. Educators and policymakers need to think differently about the ways in which teachers are prepared and about the profession for which they are being prepared.

The Professionalization of Teaching

Teacher preparation is a vital link in the current push for systemic reform. Preservice education for teachers, however, has been the subject of much criticism. The preparation of elementary teachers is criticized primarily for its lack of subject matter training in the arts and sciences, and for non-rigorous pedagogical and professional training in departments of education. The preparation of prospective secondary teachers is criticized for having a narrow content focus and providing an inadequate background in appropriate instructional strategies. In both cases, the supervised field experience is viewed as weak as well as non-substantive in terms of providing a meaningful evaluative process.

What, then, is required of teacher preparation to support a change in the role of the teacher? Art Wise believes the way to bring about a change in the role of the teacher begins with the professionalization of teaching. In Wise's opinion, the teaching profession should be governed by a common set of expectations and a single system of professional accreditation in the way that other professions are governed. Wise told Networkshop participants that he envisions the day when:

> Teachers will be held accountable for responsible professional practice; when they will be expected to know their subject matter and the professional and pedagogical bases of effective teaching, and to apply that knowledge in an ethical manner to the development of students in their charge. Teaching will become a profession in which one is not authorized to practice until he or she has had adequate professional preparation.

"Every child in America is required to go to school," said Wise. "One might think that there would be a commensurate obligation to provide these children with a fully qualified teacher." Yet, Wise asserted that as the system currently operates, it has the opposite effect. Not all children can expect to have fully qualified teachers. Indeed, the least qualified teachers tend to be placed in districts and schools where the parents are the least sophisticated, least knowledgeable, and least likely to make a fuss. Such parents are least knowledgeable about what constitutes a qualified teacher, and too unsophisticated to demand that their children be taught by teachers fully qualified in their fields.

Wise's definition of a fully qualified teacher is one who has undergone the following type of preparation: a) full liberal arts education; b) professional teacher education; and c) extended supervised clinical experience. State policymakers have targeted much attention on the aspect of liberal education. The other two areas still require leadership in the policy arena. In *Quality Teaching*, Wise (1992) has written,

> A knowledge base for effective teaching has been accumulating for years. It must be disseminated to prospective teachers so that they will have a

basis for decisions they make in practice. Those teaching out of their field are not adequately prepared in appropriate instructional practices. (p. 10)

Research on effective teachers supports Wise's advocacy for the professionalization of teaching. In a review of more than 65 studies in science education, researcher Linda Darling-Hammond (1991) found consistently positive relationships between student achievement in science and the teacher's preparation in both education and science courses. Conversely, teachers with a lack of subject matter competence in mathematics were shown to have a negative effect on student achievement in mathematics.

Wise referred to research showing that intensive clinical guidance improves the quality of instruction for beginning teachers. To the Networkshop participants, he added, "The area [of supervised clinical experience] is in flux. We certainly have legally recognized the idea that the first year of teaching is different from all the other years of teaching. What we have not done is to move toward emulating some other professions by expecting that the first year experience will be a meaningful internship."

Finally, despite the criticisms of preservice education, Darling-Hammond's synthesis of research studies on teaching conducted during the 1960s and early 1970s revealed that teachers who had undergone full preparation and licensure were, in fact, more successful with students than those who had not gone through regular preservice education.

In general, some research on teacher preparation suggests that teachers who have an appropriate knowledge base, training and practice in the use of instructional strategies, and the ability to determine what is developmentally appropriate produce better results in the classroom.

Given this knowledge base, institutions of teacher education must not be left on the sidelines in the push for systemic reform. Thus, the current thrust to professionalize teaching might be a starting place for changing the role of the teacher.

Policy Implications

The intent of this article has been to put into context the issue of systemic reform and its relationship to the way in which teachers are prepared. The discussion turns now to policy implications. Specifically, how can policy development support the notion of simultaneous reform of public schools and teacher education? No easy answers abound. The final section of this paper, however, synthesizes some ideas that have potential to promote systemic change.

Coordinated policy development. Systemic reform calls for a fundamentally different way of thinking about and making strategies for school change. As noted earlier, however, policy development in the past has served to complicate and fragment various systems. This consequence implies that coordination must begin within existing political structures. If policymakers are to focus on developing policy that is coherent and supports the concept of integration among systems, the process of coordination and collaboration must begin at the level of policy development. For example, various state committees, boards, cabinets, and agencies focusing on education might hold joint meetings. In addition, specific offices or staff positions could be designated to encourage collaboration by being responsible for

bringing these entities together on a regular basis.

New governance structures. Creating new governing structures may be another vehicle for achieving more coherent policy. In particular, an entity comprised of a cross section of delegates representing various groups with an interest in creating more successful schools (e.g., business leaders, parents, teachers, administrators, university faculty). Another approach for ensuring coordination is to consolidate existing governing boards and expand or redefine their scope of work.

New incentive structures. Policymakers need to reconsider systems of incentives that would help to attract candidates to and retain them in the teaching profession. The issue is partly economic and partly philosophical. Looking at the economic aspect, an increase in teachers' salaries is an obvious incentive for change. While they might be necessary, salary raises alone are not sufficient to improve systems of incentives. Organizational development research has shown that workers also desire worthwhile jobs, responsibility, positive working conditions, and recognition that their work as professionals is valued. Researchers who study teaching point out that school systems are designed so that effective teachers are promoted out of the classroom into administration. Many teachers, on the other hand, want career recognition of their work in the classroom or learning environment. They do not necessarily want to be advanced into administration or central office.

New teacher development systems. An implication closely related to incentive structures is to change the way teachers are prepared for, admitted into, and promoted through the profession. Prospective teachers might enter the profession beginning with an internship of a designated length before they become fully licensed or certified as teachers. The internship period would be under the control of the local school district rather than the college or university. The district, then, would be responsible for providing mentoring, observation, supervision, and other support services in a structured environment during that internship.

A corollary of "phased-in" entry to the profession is the idea of differentiation among teaching roles. Instructional staff members would hold different titles and have varying degrees of responsibility based on their preparation, quality of performance, and years of experience. Instructional staff would have different positions, including paraprofessionals, interns, instructors, teachers, and master teachers. Instructional staff members who enter the profession through alternative certification programs might be initially designated "instructors." Duties and responsibilities would be differentiated among the position, and remuneration would be commensurate with each. Responsibility and remuneration would increase as a staff member moved successfully from internship through the ranks to "master teacher."

Another state-level strategy worthy of consideration by states is the Professional Development School. According to Donna Wiseman, a Professional Development School (PDS) is a collaborative effort between a school and a university. PDSs have four components, including preservice education, professional development or inservice education, curriculum reform, and inquiry. The purpose of the PDS is to bring together university faculty, teachers, and members of the community (e.g., busi-

nesses, service agencies, parents, paraprofessionals) to collaborate and use better ways to teach and help children learn. Those involved in the process also provide the feedback and input that guide the process. Such programs show us promising examples of what systemic reform might achieve.

Leadership development. Leadership is another important component to be considered in the move toward simultaneous reform of public schools and teacher education. States legally have responsibility for the public education of students. State policymakers, therefore, must be leaders who set the stage for, and provide an example of, coherent policy. States are in the best position to provide the type of leadership needed for systemic reform because they exert considerable leverage in influencing other important parts of the system, such as the relationship between higher education and the public education system.

State-level leaders are more likely to be effective if they are in touch with educators and teacher educators who are able to ply their skills as political and instructional leaders. Twenty years of policy implementation research reveal that teachers interpret and shape the intentions of policy into action in the classroom. Besides their leverage in the classroom, teachers can play important, positive roles in influencing how policy is developed. Teacher educators can help prospective teachers become responsible, persuasive informants to policymakers. By helping prospective teachers develop their political acumen, teacher educators can contribute to the professionalization of teaching and the quality of state and local policy.◆

References

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988,Winter). Accountability and teacher professionalism. *American Educator*, 8-13; 38-43.

Boyd, V. (1992, Spring). Creating a context for change. *Issues...about change, 2*(2). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

_____ (1991, Fall). Are our teachers ready to teach? *Quality Teaching, 1*(1), pp. 6-7,10.

David, J.L., & O'Day, J.A. (1992, September). Professional development and systemic reform. Panel presented during, *Building Systemic Reform through School-Based Management and Professional Development*, a conference conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Rosslyn Hotel, Arlington, VA.

Fullan, M.G. (1989). *Implementation factors*. School Improvement Program Distinguished Lecturer Series, Portland, OR.

Fullan, M.G., & Miles, M.B. (1992, June). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 745-752.

Gideonse, H. (1992, September). Structuring teacher education to support systemic reform. Panel presented during *Building Systemic Reform through School-Based Management and Professional Development*, a conference conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Rosslyn Hotel, Arlington, VA.

National LEADership Network Study Group on Restructuring Schools. (1993). Toward Quality in Education: The Leader's Odyssey. Austin, TX: Author.

Smith, M.S., & O'Day, J.A. (1992, September). Systemic school reform and educational opportunity. Panel presented during *Building Systemic Reform through School-Based Management and Professional Development*, a conference conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Rosslyn Hotel, Arlington, VA.

Wise, A.E. (1991, Fall). Toward a profession of teaching: How we can create quality teaching. *Quality Teaching, 1*(1), pp. 1-4.

Two-Way Streets: Improving Attraction & Access of Minorities to Teaching

Panel chairman Lodis Rhodes, Professor, LBJ School of Public Policy, framed the policy discussion around the formal and informal contexts in which children learn. Panelists included Kermit McMurry, Vice Chancellor, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education; William Moore, Professor, College of Education, The University of Texas; Janie Ortega, Assistant Principal, Austin, Texas; and Gerald Shipley, Doctoral Candidate, The University of Texas at Austin and a participant in SEDL's Minority Internship Program.

During SEDL's Policy Networkshop, a veteran panel of educators held a dialogue about making the teaching profession more attractive and accessible to minorities. According to the panelists, that issue is fundamentally a problem of the education pipeline. At one end of the pipeline, **all** children must have access to a quality education. As precollegiate students, minority and non-minority children must be successfully engaged in their schooling. During that process, they need to learn from members of their families and communities that schooling is a worthwhile effort. Only if they have such support and positive schooling experiences will students, and minority students in particular, be likely to think of education as a valuable process, and teaching as a valued profession. Further along the pipeline, students must be graduated from high school. Then, if they have the motivation to pursue teaching as a profession, they will need access to higher education and teacher preparation.

Certainly, teachers need incentives and continuing professional development after they have entered the profession. For this panel, however, panelists focused their comments on the powerful influences that **governments, communities, and families** exert on the schooling process early in the pipeline. As panel members considered the nature of complex policy problems, they discussed why changing a complex system such as teacher preparation remains a difficult task. They called on members of communities and of the schooling enterprise to accept their mutual responsibility for the education of students.

Fundamental Forces for Change

The interplay of demographic, economic, and social trends is changing schools and other learning environments. Technologies are creating workplaces we can barely imagine and an aging population is producing cohorts of older learners.

Demographic imperative. Wrenching changes in the economies, societies, and politics of nations around the world have brought youngsters and families from many ethnic and language backgrounds into U.S. schools and communities. In states such as California, New Mexico, and Texas a complementary shift has taken place: students once in the minority now comprise the majority. Nearly 26 of the nation's largest school districts have minority-majority enrollments. Demographic projections show that about 38% of the total public school student body in the year 2010 will be made up of minority students.

Moral imperative. Dr. Rhodes reminded participants that such fundamental forces

represent a demographic transfer of power. Youngsters in schools and young adults in minority communities will wield influence through the decisions they make as voters, consumers, and majority members of society. As members of a global economy and multicultural society, students also need to develop and practice skills of multicultural understanding. They will be able to develop those skills only in environments that model respect for cultural, ethnic, racial, religious, and gender-related differences. Students need to be able to turn to their families or caregivers, teachers, and other adults as role models and mentors. Institutions for teacher education have a critical role to play in developing educators and paraprofessionals who will be able to help children develop skills and attitudes for a richly diverse, multicultural world.

A Problem in the Pipeline: Access and Attraction to Teaching

Demographic, economic, and societal realities also have affected the nature of the existing pool of teachers and prospective teachers. "Minority children need more effective schools," stated Janie Ortega, an assistant principal in Austin, Texas. She added that a vital need exists "to engage students in the elementary school, through high school, and into college if we want to have more minority teachers in the pool. But right now, we're not doing that." The issue is a dual one of access and attraction to the teaching profession. To have a larger pool of minority teachers from which to draw, the education system must engage and retain more of its minority students. And those students must regard teaching as a valued and valuable profession.

If minority students do not receive a high quality education, they are not likely to consider higher education or teaching as an option. Even when students complete high school and pursue higher education degrees, they tend to opt for careers in areas other than education. Jobs in education do not always have the attraction or the holding power for minority college students that those in business or industry have. As a result, a decreasing number of prospective minority teachers enter the education profession. Finally, given growing student diversity, those teachers who do complete teacher preparation programs often fail to obtain the instructional and classroom management skills vital to teaching ethnic/racial minority students, especially the ones at risk of failing or dropping out of school.

Indeed, panelist Moore indicated that the education system doesn't work for everyone. It is insidious insofar as decisions historically have been made on the basis of socioeconomic status, gender, or race—particularly socioeconomic status. Panelists agreed that the funding formulas, testing policies, and licensure policies of the education system tend to protect privilege for some, rather than fulfill opportunity for all. To make the system and teaching profession attractive and accessible to minorities, Rhodes and Moore advised participants and panelists to examine the informal and formal contexts of education. Those contexts include individuals, families, communities, institutions, and independent public policymaking systems (e.g., executive branches of government, legislatures, boards of education, departments of education, local school districts, and schools).

Contexts of Education

"We tend to talk about education and policy from a philosophical or political standpoint," said Rhodes. Instead, he reminded workshop participants that education policy- and decisionmakers need to stay focused on

students—how they learn and where they learn. To help panelists and participants focus on the places in which students learn and the people from whom they learn, Rhodes proposed a framework of **informal** and **formal contexts** of education and the interactions between them (see following Exhibit).

Informal context. The informal context centers on the individual, family, and community. Within that context are families, caregivers, religious institutions, common gathering places that might be specific to a community (e.g., grocery stores), and social organizations. The people and places of the informal context exert a powerful influence on children's ideas about their own abilities, power, and worth. Children's families and neighbors serve as strong role models. And according to Moore, "they give them beliefs, values, ethics, and ideas about the value of work." The spoken and unspoken lessons that children learn—from parents, from people who work in their communities, or from adults who act as mentors—shape their initial contact with the formal enterprise of schooling.

Once students begin their careers in the formal context of education, "the race, gender, and background of their teachers tell them something about authority and power in contemporary society." And what it tells them, according to panelist Kermit McMurry, will influence their attitudes toward school, themselves, and their accomplishments. McMurry added, "The view they form about themselves, justice, and fairness also frames their ideas about their future citizenship roles."

Minority students, as much as any group, must succeed in schools and communities. Their achievement is imperative for their own benefit and for that of our nation. If the United States is to remain productive and competitive, it cannot afford to waste a single child. The education of all children must be sufficient to help them gain a positive sense of destiny that includes a desire to continue their education throughout and beyond high school, an active participation in citizenry, and motivation to succeed in life.

Formal context. The formal context encompasses all levels of government and the enterprise of schooling. Individuals and institutions of the formal context include federal, state, and local branches of state government, state legislatures, higher education management boards, state boards of education, professional associations, school districts, and local schools. Rhodes drew a critical distinction between the broader formal context of education and the "enterprise of schooling." The latter encompasses the businesses, monies, and market relationships (e.g., testing, textbook, education technologies; in some cases food services or transportation) related to the conduct of schooling, not to the more pervasive dynamics of teaching and learning.

Interplay of two contexts. The formal context of schooling interacts with the informal context, which is concerned with the individual and the community, to regulate the enterprise of schooling. The private sector, community, and government each has a regulating function. A policymaker interested in change, advised Rhodes, must consider the interplay of policies that affect teaching and learning between the formal and informal contexts. He suggested that policy related to schooling generally revolves around the following issues: school finance; standards; assessment of teachers and students; curriculum and instruction,

Proposed Framework of Education System*

Informal Context

Individual

- Observations and "lessons learned"
- Beliefs

Families

- Parents and siblings
- Caregivers
- Extended family

Community

- Churches
- Social organizations
- Youth organizations
- Mentors
- Businesses

Informal & Formal Contexts Influence and Regulate

Formal Context

Levels of Government	*Policy*
• Federal	Federal Legislation
• State	State Legislation Rules and Regulations
• Local	Local policies Rules and Regulations

Roles

- Set Standards
- Regulation

Enterprise of Schooling

Institutions	*Policies*
• Colleges and universities • Public or common schools • Private schools	Funding Admissions Staff Appraisal Development Placement/Promotion Decisionmaking Governments Student Assessment
• Accrediting Associations	Licensing/credentials

Programs (mini enterprises)

• Accreditation	Licensing/credentials
• Testing	Assessment Curriculum and Instruction
• Textbook	Curriculum and Instruction Technologies
• Infrastructure	Facilities Technologies Transportation

* Used by Lodis Rhodes to guide panel discussion

A young man recalls

Panelist Jerry Shipley, a doctoral student in education, showed the staying power of early, informal lessons learned from his mother. A single mother, working several jobs and rearing a family, she taught him and his siblings about the value of education. She told each of her 11 children,"Honey, there's something no one can take away from you. They can burn you down, they can rip you off, they can do anything else. But there is something they won't ever take from you, and that's your education. And you can go from here to there on your education."

Shipley reflected, "I've relied on those words from my mom, and they've stood me in good stead." They also were powerful words to live by for his brothers and sisters, all of whom graduated from high school. Shipley and six brothers and sisters have continued their careers into higher education.

including textbooks; and staff recruiting, licensing/certification, and decisionmaking.

In the formal context, for example, assessment policies work to determine the placement and advancement of both prospective teachers and veteran teachers in the schooling enterprise—who is admitted to teacher education programs, who receives licensure, who receives job offers, and who retains a job. As it relates to licensing and certification, assessment/appraisal policy affects who teaches and who does not. A superintendent or principal dealing with the composition of school staff must consider how local or state assessment and recruitment policies affect the pool of prospective teachers.

When making staffing decisions, the local administrator(s) must also consider more "informal" relationships that exist between teacher and learner. Rhodes reported that a teacher and a learner can develop a relationship of such great trust that it becomes almost symbiotic. Such a relationship between mentor and protege cannot be assigned. But it is only likely to happen if teachers—minority or not—are sensitive to their students' backgrounds, and know how to create teaching and learning environments to meet their needs. Panelist Janie Ortega agreed, "You don't have to have a Black or Hispanic teacher working with Black or Hispanic kids." She asserted, however, that schools must have teachers who care about kids, who understand their culture, and who respect them.

Two-Way Streets. As part of the formal context, colleges of education have a role to play in developing a pool of sensitive, knowledgeable, and qualified minority and non-minority teacher candidates. If that is to happen, **access** and **attraction** must be two-way streets. Teaching must be an attractive option to prospective minority teachers; minority teachers must be considered valuable contributors and members of the teaching profession. They must be able to gain access into teacher preparation programs and ultimately into classrooms. Likewise, schools, colleges, and departments of education must seek and achieve access into local communities for their students and to recruit staff.

Non-Anglo teachers or paraprofessionals are a resource and contact with those communities. Because they have a direct relationship to communities, ethnic-minority teachers or paraprofessionals can teach the academic community a great deal about how to work with their students. A teacher prepa-

ration course might pair prospective teachers with knowledgeable adult mentors (e.g., parents, pastors, volunteers) from the community. Another strategy would be for a teacher preparation course to require a number of hours of service in the community. Using strategies such as these, education decisionmakers on the formal side of education might begin to draw tighter linkages between the formal context of schooling and the informal contexts of home and community.

Parents or caregivers can also influence the enterprise of schooling and make it more attractive and valuable to their children. Family "policies" (e.g., rules and codes of behavior) are powerful supports to formal schooling. Parents impart vital lessons when they reinforce beliefs such as education is important or that homework will be completed when assigned. The parent, however, must also exercise his or her responsibility and right to participate more fully in the formal context of schooling. Rhodes stated that parents must force themselves to consider their obligation to ensure that their child and the children of others receive a quality education in the formal context of schooling.

Ethnic-minority students are more likely to see teaching as a *valuable* profession if they see that teacher education programs prepare them to meet the challenges of a diverse student body; if they receive the kinds of preparation, mentoring, and fiscal support they need to become teachers; and if they are regarded as rich resources. They will be more likely to see teaching as a *valued* profession if they learn the importance of education at home and in the community; if they have meaningful relationships or mentorships with teachers in their schools; and if as novice teachers they are enabled and encouraged to decide how best to reach their students.

"Shoveling Smoke"— Solving a Complex Policy Problem

Creative, optimistic, and determined though they are, the panelists acknowledged difficulties in bringing about systemic change to improve minority attraction and access to the teaching profession. The sheer number of political entities, agencies, and organizations confounds an already complex change process. Kermit McMurry explained that the political and independent systems responsible for shaping and establishing education policy "may independently identify selective problems and deal with them in isolation by dispensing a policy solution to address the problem." The result, according to McMurry, is that the change process becomes piecemeal rather than being linked or supported in a systemic way.

When state policymakers try to take a more systemic approach to problem solving or policy development, the dynamic nature of complex problems itself becomes a concern. "You never solve a public policy problem," said Rhodes. "You never get it solved; it evolves. It's like shoveling smoke." Because a policy problem can be changed as it is resolved, or by the interference of external factors, policymakers need to have a vision of the outcome they want. Rhodes told participants, "You must have a vision of where you want to be."

Having a vision, much less a shared vision, is difficult. Variations among policymaking organizations or institutions also mark out the boundaries of turf. As effectively as any string of barbed wire, differences in language, policies, funding streams, or objectives keep some behaviors and resources

within a certain territory, while keeping others out. As long as such boundary markers exist, members of the different entities will be likely to keep to their own turf rather than venturing toward common ground. If systemic reform is to work, McMurry feels that people from different policymaking entities must be willing "to come together and develop a consensus about what needs to be done to change the system." They need to have ongoing conversations about what is needed for all members of the education system.

"Roll up your Sleeves"— Guiding Principles for Improving Access & Attraction

Panelists agreed that contact, interaction, and responsibility must flow between the formal and informal contexts of education. Rhodes called for parents, policymakers, and Networkshop participants to be active. Clearly, communities can no longer afford to overlook talented, skilled people. Instead, everyone needs to make sure that successful minority people are interacting with youngsters in their communities and fully supporting them.

Drawing upon their own creativity, commitment, and experiences, the five panelists suggested that education policy- and decisionmakers consider the following actions for improving minority access to teaching:

1. Start with a vision of what schooling and the broader education system should look like. Periodically revisit and refine the vision in light of economic, demographic, social, and technological changes.

2. Work to develop new relationships among teachers and learners, wherever and whoever they are.

3. Look to the powerful **informal context** for role models, paraprofessionals, and/or mentors. Make sure that successful people who can serve as role models or mentors are introduced into schools and community places where youngsters are.

4. Seek out informal, non-traditional places to recruit minority teachers, other staff, paraprofessionals, or volunteers—social organizations, service groups, community networks.

5. Engage members of communities, along with state and local school boards and other government entities, to play an active role in creating more effective schools in minority communities. Effective schools have holding power for all students. If more students stay in school, graduate, and choose to enter teacher education, the pool of prospective teachers will increase its representation of ethnic and racial minority groups.

6. Engage and support institutions of higher education, community organizations, and businesses in the development of useful, long-term teacher preservice and inservice programs.

7. Develop ongoing leadership development programs for local school administrators so that they can create environments that model respect for diversity.

8. Review standards and requirements of administrator certification programs to reflect commitment to and sensitivity toward diversity, different learning styles, different teaching techniques (e.g., tutoring, cross-age mentoring, and organizational structures), and different types of support/recognition needed by novice and veteran teachers.

9. Experiment with alternative methods of student assessment so that assessment is continual, rather than a high-stakes, one-shot opportunity for students.

10. Experiment with teacher assessment systems based on appropriate levels of skill at stages in a teacher's career. Develop teacher evaluation programs that have a long-term perspective, multiple indicators, and multiple stages so that assessment is not a high-stakes, one-shot opportunity for prospective and veteran teachers. ◆

This issue of NETWORK was written by Judy L. Mays, SEDL Minority Internship Program and Joyce S. Pollard, Senior Policy Associate. Graphic design was created by Lonne Parent.

I try to get people to understand that life is about opportunities. In fact, we get a lot of opportunities and we miss a lot of opportunities. And a missed opportunity should be just that—a missed opportunity. It should not be a determinant for the rest of your life. But that's what we've turned schooling into in terms of accountability. If you don't make it on a test at a strategic point, you're pushed back or out. The point is that we've created schooling so that it is no longer just a missed opportunity. Instead, a missed opportunity is setting your fate for the rest of your life. And that's evil—especially when you're dealing with kids.

—Lodis Rhodes

Selected Contacts

Teacher Education and Licensure

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
AACTE/ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036
(202)293-2450
Mary Dilworth, Senior Director of Research

Association of Teacher Educators
1900 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091-1502
(703)620-3110
(703)620-9530 (fax)
Gloria Chernay, Executive Director

Holmes Group
Michigan State University
College of Education
(517)353-9337
Gary Sykes

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)
P.O. Box 2431
Sacramento CA 95812
916/969-5560
Dick Mastain

National Center for Research on Teacher Learning
Michigan State University
College of Education
116 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1034
(517)355-9302
Mary Kennedy, Director

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036-1023
(202)466-7496
(202)296-6620 (fax)
Arthur E. Wise, President
Sheila Bodner, Assistant to the President

Professional Development

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
1320 18th Street, N.W.
Suite 401
Washington, DC 20036
(202)463-3980
(202)463-3008 (fax)

National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
Linda Darling-Hammond, Co-Director
(212)678-3432

National Council of States on Inservice Education
402 Huntington Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244-2340
(315)443-4167; (315)443-5732 (fax)

Teacher Diversity

National Center on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning
University of California, Santa Cruz
Kerr Hall
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
(408)459-3500
Eugene Garcia and Barry McLaughlin, Co-Directors

Resource Center on Educational Equity
Council of Chief State School Officers
379 Hall of the States
400 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001-1511
(202)393-8159
Cynthia Brown, Director
Glenda Partee, Assistant Director

Southern Education Foundation, Inc.
135 Auburn Ave., N.E., Second Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404)523-0001
Steve Suitts, Executive Director

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
707 17th Street, Suite 2700
Denver, CO 80202-3427
(303)299-3685
James R. Mingle, Executive Director

SEDL's Regional Policy Networkshop Participants

Mark Hudson
Legislative Analyst
Joint Interim Oversight Subcommittee on Educational Reform
AR Legislative Council
State Capitol, Room 315
Little Rock, AR 72201

Tony Minicozzi
Legislative Analyst
Bureau of Legislative Research
House Committee on Education
State Capitol, Room 315
Little Rock, AR 72201

Dr. Arthur Wise
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
2010 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036-1023

Diane Burkhart
Senior Attorney
Louisiana State Senate
P.O. Box 94183
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Yolanda Dixon
Legislative Analyst
Louisiana Senate
P.O. Box 94183
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Fred Skelton
President
LA Federation of Teachers
7417 Jefferson Hwy.
Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Ellen Bernstein
NM Federation of Teachers
321 Monroe NE
Albuquerque, NM 87108

Dr. Pauline Rindone
Deputy Director
Legislative Education Study Committee
State Capitol, Room 418
Santa Fe, NM 87503

Dr. Kermit McMurry
Vice Chancellor
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
500 Education Building
State Capitol Complex
Oklahoma City, OK
73105-4503

Paul Simon
Teacher Education
OK State Department of Education
2500 N. Lincoln Blvd.
Oklahoma City, OK
73105-4599

Ermalee Boice
Executive Director for Programs
Texas State Teachers Association
316 W. 12th Street
Austin, TX 78701

Camille Meyer
House Public Education Committee
P.O. Box 2910
Austin, TX 78768-2910

Dr. William Moore
Community College Leadership Program
EDB 348
UT-Austin
Austin, TX 78711

Sue E. Mutchler
Policy Associate
SEDL
211 E. Seventh Street
Austin, TX 78701-3281

Janie Ortega
Assistant Principal
Gullett & Pillow Elementary Schools
Austin ISD
8407 Staunton
Austin, TX 78758

Dr. Joyce S. Pollard
Senior Policy Associate
SEDL
211 E. Seventh Street
Austin, TX 78701-3281

Gerald Shipley
MIP Intern
SEDL
211 E. Seventh Street
Austin, TX 78701

Dr. Lodis Rhodes
Professor
LBJ School of Public Affairs
Drawer Y
University Station
Austin, TX 78713-7450

Juanita Wagstaff
Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas 78701

Dr. Donna Wiseman
Associate Dean
Teacher Education
Texas A&M University
College of Education
Harrington Tower, Room 107
College Station, TX 77843

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research & Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under Contract Number RP-91002003. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.